



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/725,234 11/29/00 ISHII

R 016887/1027

EXAMINER

IM52/0907

FOLEY & LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOUR
3000 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 500
P.O. BOX 25696
WASHINGTON DC 20007-8696

IP, S	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1742
DATE MAILED:

09/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/28/01; 4/4/01.
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 5
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 because the instant specification fails to provide an adequate written description of the invention. The instant specification in page 8, lines 9, 19, 23; page 9, lines 7, 18; page 10, lines 1, 8, 12; and page 14, line 4 refer to instant claims for support which are evidences that the instant specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 9-10, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over USP 5458703 to Nakai (col. 2, lines 35-51).

5. Claims 1-6, 9-10, 13-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 11179407, USP 5746843 to Miyata et al, JP 09003590, JP 08193240, USP 5972129 to Beguinot et al (col. 3, lines 13-65), or JP 01319629.

6. The cited references disclose the features substantially as claimed. The disclosed features include the claimed Fe based alloy compositions. The features relied upon described above can be found in the references at their abstracts. The difference between the reference(s) and the claims are as follows: with respect to claims 9 and 10, that the cited references do not explicitly disclose the claimed heat treatment steps. But, the invention defined in a product-by-process claim is a product, not a process. In re Bridgeford, 357 F. 2d 679, 149 USPQ 55 (CCPA 1966). It is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps which must be established. See In re Brown, 459 F. 2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972) and In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976).

7.

8. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over references as applied to claims above, and further in view of JP 09041076 (PTO-1449, A2) or by JP 09041076 alone.

9. The claimed subject matter as is disclosed and rejected above by the cited reference(s) except for use of the alloy steel for steam turbine rotor. However, JP 09041076 in the abstract teaches making steam turbine rotor with high strength and high toughness low alloy steel with known compositions as cited in the above said references. Therefore, it is contemplated within ambit of ordinary skill artisan to substitute the alloy steel of JP 09041076 with alloy steels having same or better high temperature creep strength. The use of conventional materials to perform their known functions in a conventional process is obvious. In re Raner, 134 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1962).

10. Moreover, ordinary skill artisan would recognize the alloy steel of JP 09041076 would be contaminated with N because ambient atmosphere contains N which would diffuse into molten metal as cast.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed June 28, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. Applicants argue that cited alloy steels of references contain Al and it is

detrimental to the claimed alloy steel for reason set forth in page 4 of the instant remarks. But, the argument is not persuasive because instant invention also requires deoxidation agents such as Si (page 3, lines 23-31) and Ti (paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of specification) and nitride forming agent (page 5, lines 21-32). As recognized by applicants that Al is well known as deoxidation agent and nitride former but applicants did not exclude Al in the specification or claims as originally filed. Therefore, applicants' rational is unacceptable in the absence of factual evidence.

13. Applicants' argument with respect to USP '703 is noted but instant claims 1 and 2, for examples, are merely directed to steel compositions which are disclosed by said reference.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The above rejection relies on the reference(s) for all the teachings expressed in the text(s) of the references and/or one of ordinary skill in the metallurgical art would have reasonably understood or implied from the text(s) of the reference(s). To

Serial No: 09/725,234
Art Unit: 1742

-6-

emphasize certain aspect(s) of the prior art, only specific portion(s) of the text(s) have been pointed out. Each reference as a whole should be reviewed in responding to the rejection, since other sections of the same reference and/or various combination of the cited references may be relied on in future rejection(s) in view of amendment(s).


All recited limitations in the instant claims have been met by the rejections as set forth above.

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06 (a) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.119.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (703) 308-2542. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (703)-308-1146.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit 1742 are (703) 305-3601 (Official Paper only) and (703) 305-7719 (Unofficial Paper only). When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1700, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.



SIKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1742

S. Ip
September 6, 2001